

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/336,204	BECK, AUGUST H.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Nathan S Mammen	3671	<i>NW</i>

All Participants:

(1) Nathan S Mammen.

(2) Kirt O'Neill.

Status of Application: allowed

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 9 November 2004

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

43

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner called Mr. O'Neill to obtain authorization to reorder the claim limitations in claim 43. In the submitted claim, the "a downhole hammer drill" limitation preceded the "a barrel portion" limitation. However, the hammer drill limitation referred to the barrel portion before the barrel portion was set forth. Therefore, for proper antecedent basis and clarity, an examiner's amendment would be made to place the barrel portion limitation before the downhole hammer drill. Mr. O'Neill authorized the amendment..